REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

In the final rejection the Examiner objected to the specification for failing to provide a proper antecedent basis for the subject matter claimed in claims 5, 12 and 25. In this response, claims 5, 12 and 25 have been amended to be consistent with the disclosure set forth on page 9 of the specification. It is submitted that the amendment to the claims makes the claims consistent with the disclosure in the specification and that the specification does provide a proper antecedent basis for the claimed subject matter. Accordingly, the Examiner is requested to withdraw this basis of rejection for the specification.

Claims 5, 12 and 25 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with a written description requirement. As set forth above claims 5, 12 and 25 have been amended so that the claims are consistent with the disclosure set forth in the specification. In view of the amendment to the claims it is submitted that the claims no longer fail to comply with the written description requirement and the Examiner is requested to withdraw the objection under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph.

Claims 5, 12, 25 and 35 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph as being indefinite. As set forth above claims 5, 12 and 25 have been amended to more clearly define the invention and to be consistent with the teachings of the disclosure. In view of the amendment to these claims it is submitted that they are no longer indefinite under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, and the Examiner is requested to withdraw this basis of rejection for these claims. With regard to claim 35 this claim has been amended to delete the phrase "and the like" which the Examiner indicated made the claim indefinite. In view of the amendment to claim 35 it is submitted that this claim is no longer indefinite under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, and the Examiner is requested to withdraw this basis of rejection for the claim.

Claims 1-35 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) as being unpatentable over the Collis reference in view of the Kremsmair reference.

Applicants' claims have amended to define oil localization slots that define an opening at the edge of the friction material wherein the slots have opposing sides that diverge from the opening to define a reservoir. The amended claims define the invention disclosed in applicant's specification and drawings wherein the reservoir has an increasing cross-sectional area when moving in a radial direction from the opening at the edge of the friction material towards the middle of the friction material. The Collis reference defines slots in a friction material but the slots have parallel or converging sidewalls as the sidewalls extend in a radial direction from the opening at the edge of the friction material. It is submitted that the Collis reference does not disclose or suggest a reservoir that has sidewalls that diverge in a radial direction as the sidewalls extend from the opening at the edge of the friction material as defined by applicants' claims. Accordingly, it is submitted that the Collis reference does not disclose or suggest the invention defined by applicants' claims and the Examiner is requested to withdraw this basis for rejection for the claims.

The Kremsmair reference discloses a friction lining that can be positioned on a supporting ring. The friction lining has a plurality of radial oil grooves which are formed in the friction lining. When the oil grooves are first cut in the friction lining the oil grooves that will be positioned adjacent the inner diameter of the supporting ring has converging sidewalls and the slot that will be positioned adjacent the outer circumference of the supporting ring has converging sidewalls. However, when the segments of friction material are positioned on the circular supporting ring the oil grooves that extend from the outer circumference are caused to close and the oil grooves that extend from the inner circumference of the supporting ring are caused to open whereby the oil grooves have sides that are parallel. This is clearly shown in Fig. 1 of the Kremsmair reference where a finished friction ring is displayed. Thus the Kremsmair reference discloses a friction ring having slots in the friction material

wherein the slots have parallel sides. Accordingly, the Kremsmair reference does not provides the deficiencies of the previously discussed Collis reference. In fact, the Kremsmair reference teaches away from the invention defined by applicants' claims as this reference forms slots that have converging and diverging sidewalls in the friction segments but the converging and diverging slots are designed to provide a slot with parallel sidewalls when the friction segments are bent and positioned on a circular friction ring. By taking the friction material with slots having converging and diverging sidewalls and positioning the friction material on a friction ring so that the sidewalls that define the slots become parallel, the Kremsmair reference clearly teaches that parallel sidewalls for the slots in the friction material are preferred and that slots having sidewalls that diverge in a radial direction as they move from the opening at the edge of the friction material are not preferred. This is the exact opposite from the structure that is defined by applicants' claims. Accordingly, the Kremsmair reference, taken individually or in combination with the Collis reference, does not disclose or suggest the invention defined by applicants' claims and the Examiner is requested to withdraw this basis of rejection for the claims.

In view of the amendments to the claims and the arguments set forth herein it is respectfully submitted that the claims patentably distinguish over the prior art cited by the Examiner. Accordingly, a favorable action on the claims is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

EMCH, SCHAFFER, SCHAUB
& PORCELLO CO., L.P.A.

By: Charles R. Schaub

Charles R. Schaub
Reg. No. 27,518
Tel.: (419) 243-1294